

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 2010-03-19 13:00:04

2. Agency: 015

3. Bureau: 25

4. Name of this Investment: Mint Retail Sales System (RSS)

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: 015-25-01-11-01-1002-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?: Operations and Maintenance

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? *

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.

The United States Mint's Retail Sales System (RSS), formerly the e-Business Solution Project (eSP), was developed to secure services at lower cost through electronic government (E-Government) to meet the numismatic demand and the Mint's business requirement. The primary function of the system is order processing, inventory management, accounting and merchandising. RSS was designed with off-the-shelf software to create a system that supports the Mint's core mission as well as the President's E-Government initiative. Pitney Bowes is a third party fulfillment center located in Indianapolis, IN, that provides order processing that ships orders worldwide and processes returns which are sent back to the appropriate Mint facility. Websphere/Vignette website allows customers to place and track their orders, register for subscription programs, and interact with the Mint. These are the interfaces with the RSS system: *Oracle enterprise resource planning (ERP) system interfaces with CommercialWare to replenish goods and tracks goods while in-transit from the production sites to Pitney Bowes. * Treasury's Financial Management Service (FMS) provides credit card authorizations, billing and refunds. There is an interface with the Government-wide Pay.Gov initiative. * The Citigroup provides the phone interface for quicker batch uploads of sales. * CAMDATA is a transportable point of sale system for remote sales with its own inventory management system and will function even if the RDC system halts. This project was approved by the Configuration Control Board (CCB) which include functions of the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and the Architectural Review Board (ARB) which includes functions of the Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) and Capital Investment Review Board (CIRB). The CCB provided recommendations for all request of changes and worked with ITRB to ensure the project fully complies with the Mint's Enterprise Architecture and links the project to CPIC, ProSight, and SDLC (TD-84). Final approval is provided by the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) where all final decisions are made. The project conforms with the roadmap linking the EA program to the Mint's strategic plan and aligned the Mint's Lines of Business (LOB) with the OMB's Business Reference Model (BRM).

- a. Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a risk management plan and risk register.**

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? *

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? *

10. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

- **Name:** *
- **Phone Number:** *
- **Email:** *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? *

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

| Financial management system name(s) | System acronym | Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| * | * | * |

a. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): *

- computer system security requirement;
- internal control system requirement;
- core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
- Federal accounting standard;
- U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
- this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMIA compliance area;
- Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMIA

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

| Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|-------|
| | PY1 and earlier | PY 2009 | CY 2010 | BY 2011 | BY+1 2012 | BY+2 2013 | BY+3 2014 | BY+4 and beyond | Total |
| Planning: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Acquisition: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Subtotal Planning & Acquisition: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Operations & Maintenance: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Disposition Costs (optional): | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| SUBTOTAL: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above. | | | | | | | | | |
| Government FTE Costs | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Number of FTE represented by Costs: | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| TOTAL(including FTE costs) | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President's Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table

| Contract or Task Order Number | Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16) | Has the contract been awarded (Y/N) | If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date? | Start date of Contract/Task Order | End date of Contract/Task Order | Total Value of Contract/Task Order (M) | Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N) | Is it performance based? (Y/N) | Competitively awarded? (Y/N) | What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A) | Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N) |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| TM-HQ-08-C-0071 | FFP: Firm Fixed Price | Y | 2008-07-22 | 2008-07-22 | 2012-09-30 | \$71.1 | * | * | * | * | * |

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? *

a.If "yes," what is the date? *

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

Table 1: Performance Information Table

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|-------------|--|------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2007 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Annual Sales Numismatic Items | 425000000 | 475000000 | 490500000 |
| 2007 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Customer Satisfaction Index Online Catalog | 72.3 Pct Federal Government Aggregate | 77 Percent | 82 Percent |
| 2007 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | On time delivery of products ordered | 83 Percent | 84 Percent | 94 Percent |
| 2007 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | O & M Costs within 10 percent of budget | 100 Percent of Budget | Less than 110 Percent of Budget | 100.02 Percent of Budget |
| 2008 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Annual Sales Numismatic Items | 425000000 | 490500000 | 577,000,000 |
| 2008 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Customer Satisfaction Index | 72.3 Pct Federal Government Aggregate | 77 Percent | 82 |
| 2008 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | On time delivery of products ordered | 83 Percent | 84 Percent | 83.2 |
| 2008 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | O & M Costs within 10 percent of budget | 100 Percent of Budget | Less than 110 Percent of Budget | 100 percent of Budget |
| 2009 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Annual Sales Numismatic Items | 425000000 | 5 million greater than previous year actuals | 447 Million Dollar of Numismatic Sales |
| 2009 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Customer Satisfaction Index | 72.3 Pct Federal Government Aggregate | 77 Percent | 88.3 percent for FY09 |
| 2009 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | On time delivery of products ordered | 83 Percent | 84 Percent | 84 % six month rolling average |
| 2009 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | O & M Costs within 10 percent of budget | 100 Percent of Budget | Less than 110 Percent of Budget | On budget 100 percent of budget |
| 2010 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Annual Sales Numismatic Items | 425000000 | 5 million greater than previous year actuals | |
| 2010 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Customer Satisfaction Index | 72.3 Pct Federal Government Aggregate | 77 Percent | |

Table 1: Performance Information Table

| Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Measurement Area | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Target | Actual Results |
|-------------|--|------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| 2010 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | On time delivery of products ordered | 83 Percent | 84 Percent | |
| 2010 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | O & M Costs within 10 percent of budget | 100 Percent of Budget | Less than 110 Percent of Budget | |
| 2011 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Annual Sales Numismatic Items | 425000000 | 5 million greater than previous year actuals | |
| 2011 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Customer Satisfaction Index | 72.3 Pct Federal Government Aggregate | 77 Percent | |
| 2011 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | On time delivery of products ordered | 83 Percent | 84 Percent | |
| 2011 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | O & M Costs within 10 percent of budget | 100 Percent of Budget | Less than 110 Percent of Budget | |
| 2012 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Annual Sales Numismatic Items | 425000000 | 5 million greater than previous year actuals | |
| 2012 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | Customer Satisfaction Index | 72.3 Pct Federal Government Aggregate | 77 Percent | |
| 2012 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | On time delivery of products ordered | 83 Percent | 84 Percent | |
| 2012 | Effectively Managed U.S. Government Finances | * | * | O & M Costs within 10 percent of budget | 100 Percent of Budget | Less than 110 Percent of Budget | |

Part III: For "Operation and Maintenance" investments ONLY (Steady State)

Section A: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

| 1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Description of Milestones | Planned Cost (\$M) | Actual Cost (\$M) | Planned Start Date | Actual Start Date | Planned Completion Date | Actual Completion Date | Planned Percent Complete | Actual Percent Complete |
| FY 2005 DME -- For hardware replacement, consolidation and upgrade | \$1.5 | \$1.4 | 2004-10-01 | 2004-10-01 | 2005-09-30 | 2005-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY 2005 SS | \$10.1 | \$9.1 | 2004-10-01 | 2004-10-01 | 2005-09-30 | 2005-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY 2006 SS | \$4.8 | \$4.8 | 2005-10-01 | 2005-10-01 | 2006-09-30 | 2006-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY 2007 SS | \$4.8 | \$4.8 | 2006-10-01 | 2006-10-01 | 2007-09-30 | 2007-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY 2008 SS | \$4.9 | \$4.9 | 2007-10-01 | 2007-10-01 | 2008-09-30 | 2008-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY 2009 SS | \$17.8 | \$17.8 | 2008-10-01 | 2008-10-01 | 2009-09-30 | 2009-09-30 | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| FY 2010 SS | \$15.7 | \$13.1 | 2009-10-01 | 2009-10-01 | 2010-09-30 | | 83.33% | 83.33% |
| FY 2011 SS | * | * | 2010-10-01 | | 2011-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| FY 2012 SS | * | * | 2011-10-01 | | 2012-09-30 | | 0.00% | 0.00% |

* - Indicates data is redacted.